

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-22 are currently pending in this application. Pursuant to the July 2, 2007 Office Action, claim 19 was objected to and claims 1-22 were rejected. By way of this Reply, claim 19 has been amended to correct the informality noted in the Office Action. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been introduced into the application by these amendments.

**Claim Objections**

Claim 19 has been objected to for use of the trademark “DMD.” In response to this objection, claim 19 has been amended to replace the term “DMD” with “digital micromirror device.” Withdrawal of this claim objection is respectfully requested.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102(b)**

Claims 1-7, 14, 15, 17, and 20-22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2001/0043113 (Hoshino et al.). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and submits that the presently claimed invention is distinguishable from Hoshino et al. because Hoshino et al. does not teach or suggest (1) “a load driving section/means,” or (2) “a switching section/means.”

**(1) load driving section/means**

Independent claims 1, 14, and 17 of the present invention all recite a driving apparatus which includes, in pertinent part, “a *load driving section* configured to

drive the load by supplying a voltage and a current.” Independent claims 20-22 similarly recite, in pertinent part, “*load driving means* for driving the load by supplying a voltage and a current.” Applicant respectfully submits that Hoshino et al. does not teach or suggest a load driving section/means as recited in independent claims 1, 14, 17, and 20-22.

The Office Action incorrectly states that the load driving section/means of independent claims 1, 14, 17, and 20-22 corresponds to element 15 in FIG. 1 of Hoshino et al. However, element 15 in Hoshino et al. corresponds to a load itself and does not drive the load as required by independent claims 1, 14, 17, and 20-22.

Because a “load driving section/means” is not taught or suggested in Hoshino et al., Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of independent claims 1, 14, 17, and 20-22 of the present invention.

**(2) “a switching section”**

Independent claims 1, 14, and 17 of the present invention also recite that the driving apparatus includes “*a switching section* configured to switch conditions of the load driven by the load driving section.” Applicant respectfully submits that Hoshino et al. does not teach or suggest “a switching section” as recited in independent claims 1, 14, and 17.

The Office Action incorrectly states that the switching section of independent claim 1, 14, and 17 corresponds to elements 31, 33 and 35 of Hoshino et al. However, elements 31, 33, and 35 in Hoshino et al. only raise the voltage to be

applied to an output terminal 5. See Hoshino et al. at pars. [0038] – [0045]. Elements 31, 33, and 35 in Hoshino et al. do not switch the conditions of the load (e.g., the LED to be driven) as required by independent claims 1, 14, and 17 of the present application.

Because “a switching section” is not taught or suggested in Hoshino et al., Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of independent claims 1, 14, and 17 of the present invention.

**(3) "switching means"**

Independent claims 20-22 of the present invention also recite that the driving apparatus includes “*switching means* for switching conditions of the load driven by the load driving means.” Applicant respectfully submits that Hoshino et al. does not teach or suggest the “switching means” as recited in independent claims 20-22.

The Office Action incorrectly states that the switching means of independent claim 20-22 corresponds to elements SW<sub>1</sub> through SW<sub>7</sub> (Fig. 5) of Hoshino et al. However, elements SW<sub>1</sub> through SW<sub>7</sub> in Hoshino only raise the voltage to be applied to the output terminal 5 (similar to elements 31, 33 and 35 in Hoshino et al.). Elements SW<sub>1</sub> through SW<sub>7</sub> in Hoshino et al. do not switch the conditions of the load (for example, the LED to be driven) as required by claims 20-22 of the present invention.

Furthermore, the Office Action also incorrectly states that the switching means of claims 21 and 22 corresponds to element 6 in Figure 4 of Hoshino et al.

Element 6 in Hoshino et al. is a current mirror circuit which controls the driving current of LEDs 15a and 15b. Element 6 does not switch the conditions of the load (*e.g.*, the LED to be driven) as required by claims 21 and 22. In addition, element 6 in Hoshino et al. cannot cause one of the LEDs 15a and 15b to be turned on and the other to be turned off (*i.e.*, it cannot switch the LED to be turned off, between LEDs 15 and 15b).

Because the “switching means” is not taught or suggested in Hoshino et al., Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of independent claims 20-22 of the present invention.

Claims 2-7 and 15 are dependent upon claims 1 or 14, and are believed to be allowable over Hoshino et al. for the same reasons provided above. Based on the foregoing, withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of claims 1-7, 14, 15, and 20-22 is respectfully requested.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103(a)**

Dependent claims 8-13 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Hoshino et al. in view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0142047 (Inoue et al.). Dependent claims 18 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Hoshino et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,129,437 (Koga et al.).

Claims 8-13, 16, 18, and 19 are dependent upon claims 1 or 14. Because independent claims 1 and 14 are believed to be allowable over the primary

reference, Hoshino et al., for the reasons provided above, dependent claims 8-13, 16, 18, and 19 should likewise be allowed over the cited prior art for the same reasons. Based on the foregoing, withdrawal of the obviousness rejections of claims 8-13, 16, 18, and 19 is respectfully requested.

**Conclusion**

If the Examiner believes that any additional minor formal matters need to be addressed in order to place this application in condition for allowance, or that a telephone interview will help to materially advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone at the Examiner's convenience.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application, including claims 1-22, is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
Naoto Shimada

By /Ryan W. O'Donnell/  
Ryan W. O'Donnell  
Registration No. 53,401

Volpe and Koenig, P.C.  
United Plaza, Suite 1600  
30 South 17<sup>th</sup> Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
Telephone: (215) 568-6400  
Facsimile: (215) 568-6499  
RWO/mds  
Enclosure